

EDMONDS CITY COUNCIL APPROVED MINUTES

September 28, 2010

At 6:00 p.m., Mayor Cooper announced that the City Council would meet in executive session regarding labor negotiation strategy. He stated that the executive session was scheduled to last approximately 60 minutes and would be held in the Jury Meeting Room, located in the Public Safety Complex. No action was anticipated to occur as a result of meeting in executive session. Elected officials present at the executive session were: Mayor Cooper, and Councilmembers Bernheim, Plunkett, Buckshnis, Peterson, Petso and Wilson. Others present were Human Resources Director Debi Humann and City Clerk Sandy Chase. At 7:03 p.m., the executive session was extended for 10 minutes by Ms. Chase. The executive session concluded at 7:17 p.m.

The regular City Council meeting was called to order at 7:21 p.m. by Mayor Cooper in the Council Chambers, 250 5th Avenue North, Edmonds. The meeting was opened with the flag salute.

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT

Mike Cooper, Mayor
Steve Bernheim, Council President
D. J. Wilson, Councilmember
Michael Plunkett, Councilmember
Lora Petso, Councilmember
Strom Peterson, Councilmember
Diane Buckshnis, Councilmember

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT

Adrienne Fraley-Monillas, Councilmember

STAFF PRESENT

Stephen Clifton, Community Services/Economic Development Director
Brian McIntosh, Parks & Recreation Director
Phil Williams, Public Works Director
Lorenzo Hines, Finance Director
Rob Chave, Planning Manager
Debi Humann, Human Resources Director
Frances Chapin, Cultural Services Manager
Rob English, City Engineer
Kris Gillespie, Cultural Services Assistant
Sandy Chase, City Clerk
Jana Spellman, Senior Executive Council Asst.
Jeannie Dines, Recorder

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

COUNCIL PRESIDENT BERNHEIM MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER BUCKSHNIS, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA IN CONTENT AND ORDER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

Council President Bernheim requested Item E be removed from the Consent Agenda.

COUNCILMEMBER WILSON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. The agenda items approved are as follows:

A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 21, 2010.

- C. **APPROVAL OF CLAIM CHECKS #121352 THROUGH #121432 DATED SEPTEMBER 23, 2010 FOR \$380,737.93. APPROVAL OF PAYROLL DIRECT DEPOSIT AND CHECKS #49807 THROUGH #49849 FOR THE PERIOD SEPTEMBER 1, 2010 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 15, 2010 FOR \$632,408.56.**
- D. **AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE A REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ) FOR CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE INTERURBAN TRAIL PROJECT.**

ITEM E: AUTHORIZE \$82,415 IN MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX FROM THE STREET CONSTRUCTION/IMPROVEMENT FUND (FUND #112) FOR THE 2009 ASPHALT OVERLAY PROJECT.

Council President Bernheim explained this was approval of an overage for a street project. He suggested continuing the past practice of a preliminary review by Council Committee. It was the consensus of the Council to refer this item for review by the Community Services/Development Services Committee.

3. PROCLAMATION IN RECOGNITION OF OCTOBER AS NATIONAL ARTS & HUMANITIES MONTH.

Mayor Cooper read a proclamation declaring October as National Arts and Humanities Month in Edmonds. He presented the proclamation to Cultural Services Manager Francis Chapin.

4. EDMONDS ARTS COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT.

Cultural Services Manager Francis Chapin thanked the Council and Edmonds citizens for their support of arts and culture in the community. She pointed out the proclamation notes the importance of arts in the national economy, the same is true for Edmonds. Of the 1700 registered businesses in Edmonds, 164 are arts related. Those arts-related businesses employ approximately 500 people. The number of arts-related businesses does not include the many individual artists who live and create art in Edmonds.

Ms. Chapin urged the public to take time for art during October by participating in an art-related event in the City or in the region. Arts Crush, a regional arts festival, features 350 free and discounted events during October. In Edmonds Seattle artist Marita Dingus will lead a free hands-on public art making project using recycled materials on Sunday, October 10.

Ms. Chapin introduced Mary Monfort, Chair, Edmonds Arts Commission; and Pam Harold, Arts Commissioner; and Kris Gillespie, Cultural Services Assistant.

Ms. Monfort explained this is the Edmonds Arts Commission's 35th year. The Arts Commission is very involved in cultural resources and opportunities in Edmonds as well as the participation of citizens and visitors. This is accomplished in four ways:

1. Arts and Culture – arts and culture bring visitors to Edmonds. Cultural tourism includes Write on the Sound, a writing conference celebrating its 25th anniversary this year. The event has expanded from one day to three days and is self supporting. Many of the people who visit Edmonds for its cultural tourism stay for the weekend, adding to economic development. The Arts Commission also provides tourism promotion support awards. Over the last 12 years, the Commission has given out 84 awards to 20 different local cultural organizations to support events that attract visitors to Edmonds as well as entertain local citizens. Recipients have included the Olympic Ballet Theater, Cascade Symphony, Driftwood Players, Third Thursday Art Walk, Jazz Connection, Arts Studio Tour, SnoKing Chorale and many others.
2. Arts Education – arts education for youth assists in creating a community of problem solvers with collaborative and strategic thinking abilities. Over the past 25 years, the Arts Commission has

awarded 53 student scholarships in literary and performing arts. Scholarships are funded by donation and the proceeds from the writers conference. Recipients have become Rhode Scholars, students at Julliard and other prestigious programs as well as musicians, actors and music teachers. The Commission has sponsored an Artist in Residence program in the Edmonds School District since 1993. As part of the Best Book Poster Contest, a collaboration between the Commission, the Edmonds School District and Friends of the Edmonds Library, 560 awards have been given to third graders for poster art celebrating their favorite book.

3. Concerts in the Park and Public Art – the original mandate for the Commission included providing a variety of arts to enhance the quality of life for citizens of Edmonds. The Commission has been active in providing both programs and leadership in cultural planning for the future through their concerts in the park. Over the last 20 years, 160 concerts have been provided. In the last 8 years, the Commission received \$4000 each year from two community sponsors, Lynnwood Honda and Acura of Lynnwood. Attendance averages 400 people per concert, 1/3 to 1/2 are visitors to Edmonds. There are over 150 original artworks with 30 permanently sited, many of which have become iconic such as the downtown fountain. Many artworks are funded by donations primarily from the Edmonds Arts Festival Foundation. The newest artwork is a transportation project on Hwy. 99 at the Swift stations.
4. Partnerships – the Arts Commission has been very successful at leveraging a limited budget via partnerships with Edmonds Community College, Edmonds Library and Edmonds Center for the Arts. The Commission has worked with the Friends of the Edmonds Library on the Best Book Poster Contest, with local schools to augment arts education, business sponsorships for concerts and the writers conference, joint visual arts exhibits presented with the Edmonds Arts Festival Foundation and funding provided by the Edmonds Arts Festival Foundation for public art maintenance and art acquisition.

Ms. Monfort thanked the Council and citizens for their foresight in establishing the Arts Commission in 1975. She thanked the Council for their support and continued recognition of the arts as a critical component in the identity and economic vitality of the community.

Mayor Cooper thanked the Arts Commission for all their efforts.

5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Natalie Shippen, Edmonds, explained that absent an answer to her question regarding the \$26 million expenditure in the WSF's long range plan, she would assume it would be used to construct a second slip at the Main Street terminal. She anticipated a second slip would triple existing ferry traffic. One slip can accommodate three ferries, two slips can handle six ferries. There are currently two ferries in use which are anticipated to handle the volume until 2031. The increase in traffic will be the result of population growth as well as WSF's plans to divert ferry traffic from the Bainbridge Island ferry route. She urged the Council to establish a policy opposing a second slip at the Main Street terminal.

Ron Wambolt, Edmonds, referred to Council comments at last week's meeting that they lost a tremendous amount of faith in the information provided during the Fire District 1 (FD1) process and reached a conclusion that none of the numbers would be 100% accurate. There was also concern expressed that the previous Finance Director developed the numbers and left for employment at FD1. He took offense to those comments due to the amount of time he worked on the FD1 proposal as a Councilmember, attending every meeting with FD1, meetings with the firefighters union and spending time researching the issue. He encouraged those Councilmembers to listen to the presentation made by Mayor Haakenson on September 15, 2009 or read the minutes of that meeting. Mayor Haakenson provided a very comprehensive presentation that covered all aspects of the contract offer. He read from the September 15, 2009 minutes with regard to documents provided to the Council regarding the FD1 contract offer, proposed purchase of the fire stations by FD1 and due diligence done on the contract offer.

by Finance Director Lorenzo Hines following the resignation of Finance Director Kathleen Junglov. At that time, he (Mr. Wambolt) requested an analysis of selling versus retaining the fire stations. Mr. Wambolt summarized when the contract was concluded, instead of saving \$800,000, the proposal indicated savings of \$900,000. To the comment the City is losing the EMS revenue, he clarified the City retains the EMS levy revenue; the EMS transport fees go with the stations and when the City retained the fire stations, it retained the transport fees.

Al Rutledge, Edmonds, suggested the City recognize three long time Ballinger area residents who passed away recently. Next, he suggested the City provide an explanation regarding the proposed increase in the TBD license fee in the newspaper or mailed to residents and not just online. With regard to Fire District 1, he relayed there may be an increase in the contract in 2013.

Roger Hertrich, Edmonds, recalled concern that was expressed last year regarding the proposed Fire District 1 contract. Due to the transition in Finance Directors at the same time, he felt the City should have hired a consultant to assist the City. The purpose of the recent scrutiny of the budget is citizens and the Council's interest in clarity. He viewed the recent response by staff to Council and citizen questions as defensive rather than open and helpful. He recommended the current system be amended to show all the money in all reports and not just in the CAFR. He also expressed concern with the small size print used in the reports for Agenda Item 6.

Finis Tupper, Edmonds, referred to the 2009-2010 Mid-Year Budget Amendment, displaying a magnifying glass that was needed to read the reports. He referred to regulations regarding the biennium budget in RCW 35A, Section 34.130, mid-biennial budget and modification, which states public hearings shall be provided on the proposed modification. He pointed out the proposed budget adjustment has never been advertised as a public hearing. He referred to the Emergency Financial Reserve Fund as "magical money" because it appears in some reports and not in others. He expressed concern with the use of different names for funds such as REET 2 which is often referred to as Fund 125. He urged the City to improve the quality of its reports.

6. CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ACTION ON THE 2009-2010 MID-YEAR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT.

Councilmember Plunkett requested staff comment on Mr. Tupper's reference to State law requiring a public hearing on budget amendments. Finance Director Lorenzo Hines responded the Council had a public hearing on the mid-biennial budget on December 15, 2009. He offered to research the RCW regarding the requirement for a public hearing on amendments to the budget. Mayor Cooper relayed his understanding that the requirement for a public hearing was for adjustments at the mid-biennium. He noted City Attorney Scott Snyder had not advised the Council of the need for a public hearing during previous discussion regarding the mid-year budget amendment.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT BERNHEIM MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON, TO APPROVE THE MID-YEAR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT, ORDINANCE NO. 3808.

Councilmember Petso referred to Exhibit A, recalling the Council's action last week was to take B Fund contributions that had been suspended and make them for 2010. She could see the expenditure lines had increased for the General Fund to reflect that contribution but there was not a corresponding deposit in the 511 Fund. Mr. Hines advised the 2010 budget had not been amended to reflect General Fund contributions not being made to the B Fund; therefore nothing needed to be done. As a result it would be reflected in the General Fund but there was no need to adjust the 511 Fund because that contribution was already reflected. Councilmember Petso asked whether the 511 Fund already reflected the contribution but the General Fund did not reflect that it would be made. Mr. Hines suggested Councilmember Petso visit him for an explanation of the mechanism between funds. Councilmember Petso advised she would

not support the motion because it seems like both numbers should have moved together. Mr. Hines assured the Council's action regarding the B Fund contribution would be implemented.

Councilmember Buckshnis explained she was able to reconcile the revenue and the expenditure by comparing the second amendment to the third amendment. She recommended the reports be labeled more appropriately such as with a date and amendment 1, amendment 2 and amendment 3.

Mayor Cooper inquired about his authority to break a tie vote on an ordinance. City Clerk Sandy Chase advised pursuant to State law, the mayor may vote to break ties but not in relation to the passage of an ordinance, an appropriation for the expenditure of money or the granting of a franchise.

UPON ROLL CALL, MOTION FAILED (3-3), COUNCIL PRESIDENT BERNHEIM AND COUNCILMEMBERS WILSON AND PETERSON VOTING YES; AND COUNCILMEMBERS BUCKSHNIS, PLUNKETT AND PETSO VOTING NO.

Council President Bernheim commented in his opinion this was an excellent exercise, having specific and sophisticated discussions about the City's budget. He referred to a newspaper headline, "Lynnwood Officials Blamed for Red Ink," commenting Edmonds was doing a good job avoiding such headlines via this type of discussion. He encouraged Councilmembers to have the basis for their objections addressed and said he would schedule the mid-year budget amendment on next week's agenda.

Mayor Cooper suggested since the Council will be asked in November to deliberate on a yearend budget, he and Council President Bernheim discuss whether to simply bundle the mid-year budget amendments with the yearend amendment. Council President Bernheim preferred to give the Council the opportunity to consider the mid-year adjustment again next week.

Mr. Hines clarified by the Council's non-action on the mid-year budget amendment, reversing the suspension of B Fund contributions, moving the money in Fund 511 related to the sale of fire equipment into the Public Safety Reserve Fund and moving the original fire safety funds into the Public Safety Reserve Fund and to the Facilities Fund will not occur. Mayor Cooper summarized none of the changes would take place until the ordinance was approved.

7. DISCUSSION ON THE CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN (2011-2016).

City Engineer Rob English explained the Council packet contains the draft 2011-2016 Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) and the 2011-2016 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). In response to Council direction last year, the CFP and CIP have been separated in order to identify projects related to growth in the CFP. In prior years the CFP and CIP were contained in one document.

The CFP dates from City's first GMA comprehensive plan completed in 1995. It identifies improvements tied to a six-year project and funding plan. The CFP is in response to a GMA mandate. The improvements in the CFP accommodate the City's projected population growth. The CIP is a budget planning tool (2011-2016). It includes preservation and maintenance projects as well as CFP projects. It is a 6-year plan with estimated expenditures and funding sources.

Mr. English provided a diagram showing components found only in the CIP and only in the CFP and components found in both the CIP and CFP. The CIP contains 6-year maintenance projects with funding sources as well as 6-year capital projects with funding sources; the CFP contains long range (20-year) capital project needs as well as 6-year capital projects with funding sources.

He provided a comparison of the CIP and CFP:

	CIP	CFP
Mandate?	None	GMA
Reason?	Budget	GMA
Time Frame?	6 year	6 year 20 year
Must include Capital?	Yes	Yes
Must include Maintenance?	Yes	No

The draft 2011-2016 CFP contains 3 project sections:

- General
 - Parks, Buildings & Regional projects
- Transportation
 - Safety/Capacity & Pedestrian/Bicycle
- Stormwater

The CFP identifies the purpose and potential funding sources for projects. The CFP include individual descriptions sheets for each project.

The draft CIP provides supporting information for the CFP. The CIP contains two project sections: General and Parks. The CIP is organized by the City's financial fund numbers. The CIP contains preliminary estimates on six year expenditures and revenues.

He provided a list of fund numbers:

Fund	Description	Department
112	Transportation	Public Works
113	Multimodal Transportation	Community Services
116	Buildings Maintenance	Public Works
125	REET-2 Transportation	Public Works
125	REET-2 Parks Improvement	Parks & Recreation
126	Parks Acquisition	Parks & Recreation
129	Special Projects	Parks & Recreation
132	Parks- Construction (Grant Funding)	Parks & Recreation
412-100	Water Projects	Public Works
412-200	Storm Projects	Public Works
412-300	Sewer Projects	Public Works
414	Wastewater Treatment Plant	Public Works

Mr. English reviewed the CFP schedule:

September 8, 2010	Introduction to Planning Board
September 14, 2010	Community Services/Development Services Council Committee
September 28, 2010	Introduction to City Council
October 5, 2010	Public hearing at City Council
December 2010	Adopt with Comprehensive Plan Update

He invited the Council to provide feedback prior to the October 5 public hearing. He corrected the agenda memo, stating staff was seeking approval of the CIP with approval of the CFP next week.

Councilmember Wilson commented staff was in a difficult position because there was a great deal of political reality in these somewhat bureaucratic documents. He found it disappointing that the City had not identified enough money to do any of the projects in the CFP. Although there was a great deal of good planning by staff, the political leaders have identified nine elements on the list including building a new aquatic center, fixing the Boys & Girls Club and acquiring the Civil Playfields, yet no funds are expended in the Plan until 2017 and those funds are only placeholders. By adopting the CFP, the Council was not committing to do anything because there was no money to do anything with.

With regard to the CIP, Councilmember Wilson reiterated his concern with the Transportation Benefit District's proposed increase in the vehicle license fee to \$60. He recognized the difficulty for staff to plan for capital improvements when the outcome of the TBD vote was not yet known. He was hesitant to support the CIP without that information.

Councilmember Buckshnis explained two subcommittees of the Citizen Levy Committee are considering a capital plan. Mill Creek has placed a capital improvement levy on the ballot that will fund 7-8 projects. She noted the Levy Committee subcommittees may not agree with the \$5-23 million estimate for an aquatics center; they have received information that the pool could be fixed for \$950,000. The Levy Committee also plans to conduct a survey to determine what projects citizens would be willing to support.

Councilmember Petso relayed her understanding that the Economic Development Commission was discussing a permanent farmers market. She asked whether planning was far enough along that this project could be included in the CIP/CFP. Community Services/Economic Development Director Stephen Clifton responded the farmers market was not at the point where it could be included in the CFP; only conversations were taking place now. There is already a garden and summer market that includes products from the farming community; the need for a larger farmers market has not yet been determined.

Council President Bernheim asked whether staff was asking the Council to prioritize/rank the projects. He asked the purpose of the public hearing and whether the Council would be asked to adopt a wish list that had no funding. Mr. English answered the public hearing next week is on the CFP. Staff recommends at the conclusion of the public hearing that the Council approve the CFP and the CIP. The CFP and CIP will also be adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan in December. The projects in the CIP are staff's projection of what capital improvement projects are needed. There are many sources used to develop the CIP including the Storm and Surface Water Plan and the Water Plan; both plans have CIPs and these documents reflect the projects in those plans. The Council approved the Transportation Plan in 2009 which also contains a CIP. Those plans and staff's recommendations were used to create the project lists. Council has the ability to address priorities if desired.

In response to Councilmember Wilson's comments, Public Works Director Phil Williams pointed out the plan has numerous funded projects. The utilities have the current resources or the ability to acquire resources to complete their CIP elements. He acknowledged funding for transportation projects was tenuous. The first three years of the CIP are required to be financially constrained. Because the outcome of the TBD vote is unknown, there is little funding included in the first three years for transportation projects unless there are existing or anticipated grants. The speculative revenues from the TBD are in the last three years of the CIP.

Councilmember Wilson referred to the nine projects listed in the CFP that do not have any funding identified in the next six years and Mr. Williams' comment that the Utility funds have funding for some elements of the CFP. Mr. Williams advised the majority of the Utilities' capital projects are not in the CFP because they are not related to growth, they are typically scheduled or necessary replacement of aging infrastructure. Councilmember Wilson asked whether any capital facility investments were being

made with funds that did not appear in the CIP/CFP. Mr. Williams responded his comment was related to both documents.

Mr. English explained there were three sections in the CFP, 1) General which includes aquatics, Edmonds Crossing, etc.; 2) Transportation and 3) Stormwater. He referred to projects in the Stormwater section of the CFP, advising they would be funded via the Stormwater Utility.

Councilmember Wilson asked whether the projects in the General section were ranked in years 4-6. Mr. Williams welcomed the Council's input regarding priority in years 4-6. Mr. English advised the Transportation and Stormwater sections reflect Comprehensive Plan elements previously approved by Council. A priority system was established and there was public input on those projects. Mr. McIntosh advised the nine General projects were not in any prioritized order. Some of the projects could be considered further along than others such as the Aquatics Center due to the Yost Pool Feasibility Study and the Parks Maintenance Facility due to the conceptual study that has been completed for that facility.

Councilmember Wilson relayed his understanding that staff viewed the Parks Maintenance Facility as about to fall down. He asked whether that would increase its priority. Mr. McIntosh responded establishing a priority would require evaluation of all the City's buildings. The Parks Maintenance Facility was constructed by Parks crews in 1968; he did not consider it falling down but rather a facility inadequate for the City's needs. Councilmember Wilson referred to the Arts Center on the list of General projects, noting there may be people interested in making that the top priority. He preferred the projects be prioritized.

8. **DISCUSSION OF A POTENTIAL COUNCIL POLICY DEDICATING A SIGNIFICANT PORTION OF UNEXPENDED WAGES AND BENEFITS TO THE PURPOSE OF ACHIEVING AND MAINTAINING APPROPRIATE TARGETED RESERVES IN BOTH THE EMERGENCY FINANCIAL RESERVE FUND AND THE GENERAL FUND ENDING CASH BALANCE.**

Councilmember Petso explained every year there are significant amounts in salary savings as a result of positions that are not filled or are vacant for a period of time. In the past those funds flowed into the General Fund ending balance. The policy she proposed would check those funds against the balance in the Emergency Reserve Fund and the targeted ending cash balance of the General Fund prior to diverting those funds for other purposes. In the past staff used salary savings responsibly to fund a number of items. There have now been recommendations from members of the public to fund items from salary savings. She asked whether the Council was interested in her pursuing a policy that would ensure at least a significant portion of the salary savings were checked against reserves prior to being expended. She envisioned working with staff to determine a workable portion. She also planned to work with the Citizen Levy Committee who is considering appropriate reserve levels. If there was not a recommendation from staff, she would consult the Governmental Finance Officers Association (GFOA) regarding an appropriate reserve level. Her research of typical reserve levels found 5% for the Emergency Reserve Fund and an ending cash target of 15%.

Councilmember Buckshnis advised the Citizen Levy Committee is considering appropriate levels. The GFOA recommends two months; Edmonds' policy is one month. She recommended a determination be made regarding whether the position is needed and if not, the funds could be moved and if the position is needed, the funds should remain.

Council President Bernheim expressed support for the approach due to his preference to bank savings as much as possible. He supported Councilmember Petso developing a policy for Council consideration.

Councilmember Plunkett expressed interest in the concept subject to the details.

Councilmember Wilson commented the idea had merit; in practice the funds would be included in the ending fund balance assuming it was not spent elsewhere. He envisioned City Attorney Scott Snyder would say the policy did not matter; when the Council appropriated dollars in the budget, the mayor can spend up to that budgeted amount. Actually limiting the spending of savings from a vacant position would require the passage of a budget amendment. Mayor Cooper advised he has not nor will he spend salary savings without the Council's approval.

Councilmember Peterson agreed it would be difficult in practice, noting when a director's position was vacant, there may be additional expenses due to the lack of a director such as hiring a consultant. At the end of the year, it has been the practice of the City not to spend leftover funds. He summarized it was worth considering but may be difficult in reality.

Councilmember Petso summarized she would continue her efforts to develop a policy for Council consideration.

9. DISCUSSION REGARDING PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION ON THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FRAMEWORK.

Planning Manager Rob Chave explained the proposed changes were primarily to the introductory section of the Comprehensive Plan. The update is scheduled for public hearing at a future meeting. He explained there are several reasons for this update:

- PSRC updated the regional plan via adoption of Vision 2040. The City's Comprehensive Plan refers to the previous 2020 plan
- The Comprehensive Plan was updated to include a new Community Sustainability Element which provides a central framework for the Plan
- Some of the discussion in the City's Comprehensive Plan is out-of-date

Councilmember Buckshnis advised Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) is in the process of updating the countywide planning policies. She compared the policies being considered by SCT with the update and found them very similar. She anticipated additional revisions would be required as SCT completes their review of the countywide planning policies. Mr. Chave commented SCT's recommendations and the Snohomish County Council adoption of new countywide planning policies will set the stage for the more extensive update of the Comprehensive Plan in 2014. The intent is to reflect the regional plans in the countywide planning policies.

Councilmember Plunkett asked whether it would be preferable to make amendments to the document tonight or at the public hearing. Council President Bernheim advised the public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan framework was scheduled on October 19. He suggested Councilmembers circulate any amendments as soon as possible and make the amendments on October 19.

Councilmember Plunkett commented many of his questions had been addressed by the Planning Board and were reflected in their minutes. Councilmember Plunkett referred to the Purpose section, and inquired why the language in paragraph D (To encourage coordinated development and discourage piecemeal, spot or strip zoning and inharmonious subdividing) was proposed to be eliminated. Mr. Chave explained the question at the Planning Board focused specifically on spot zoning. The language regarding coordinated development is contained in other paragraphs. Spot zoning can be traced to the early GMA planning process when the City's Comprehensive Plan map was very general, containing "bubbles" with general Comprehensive Plan designations. As a result questions arose over zoning in those areas as well as concern that an area could be zoned in a manner that was unrelated to its surroundings, a spot zone. There is now a one-to-one relationship between the Comprehensive Plan map and the Zoning map, leaving little opportunity for spot zoning.

Councilmember Plunkett asked why the language regarding spot zoning could not be retained in the Purpose section. Mr. Chave answered since zoning must be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, a spot zoning request/action would require that the Comprehensive Plan provided for a land use that was inconsistent with its surroundings.

Next, Councilmember Plunkett referred to language proposed to be removed in the Effect of Plan section, Paragraph A (Private Projects. All private projects requiring city review and approval shall be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan). He commented consistency with the Comprehensive Plan was an important consideration in quasi judicial decisions. He also expressed concern with the removal of language in Paragraph B regarding public projects. Mr. Chave answered the GMA did not provide for a consistency measurement of development projects against the Comprehensive Plan. The GMA requires development projects be measured against the development regulations and the development regulations are adopted to implement the Comprehensive Plan. In the review of site specific development projects, consideration typically is given to development regulations, not the Comprehensive Plan.

Similarly the Growth Management Hearings Board does not review development projects. It considers consistency of development regulations with the Comprehensive Plan and consistency of the Comprehensive Plan with State goals. The GMA creates a hierarchy; the Comprehensive Plan is the policy level document, development regulations weigh the Comprehensive Plan policies and that drives the adoption of development regulations. That same balancing does not occur in site specific reviews; the project is evaluated against the adopted development regulations. He envisioned inconsistent decision could result if consistency with the development regulations was considered as well as consistency with the very broadly worded Comprehensive Plan goals and policies.

Councilmember Plunkett commented consistency with the Comprehensive Plan had been a consideration in the recent past. Mr. Chave explained it depended on the development regulations. The Comprehensive Plan was only considered when required by the development regulation. The language in Paragraphs A and B introduce consistency with the Comprehensive Plan where it is not necessarily relevant. For example, rezone criteria in the development code requires consideration of the Comprehensive Plan. Rezone regulations have a much closer nexus with Comprehensive Plan purpose, intent and land use patterns than other development regulations. Conversely accessory dwelling units have little to do with the Comprehensive Plan; there would be little in the Comprehensive Plan policies that could be used to compare one ADU to another. He summarized it was not appropriate to have a blanket statement that all projects would be reviewed relative to the Comprehensive Plan.

Councilmember Plunkett asked whether the language would still apply to rezones. Mr. Chave answered yes because the development code includes a criteria regarding Comprehensive Plan consistency. He concluded none of the proposed revisions would change that.

Councilmember Plunkett referred to population targets in the Growth Management section, inquiring whether this was a change in the City's population targets. Mr. Chave answered it was not. Councilmember Plunkett asked whether staff anticipated the City's population targets would change in the future. Mr. Chave answered the next change that will reflect the new planning period and growth targets will occur in 2014. The Comprehensive Plan was originally required to be updated in 2011; the legislature extended that deadline due to the economy.

Councilmember Plunkett suggested the sentence at the end of the second paragraph on page 3 be revised to read, "While general decisions on how the region will grow are made collaboratively at a regional level, it is up to each community, particularly elected officials, to determine how to implement this vision at the local level.' He felt community was too broad. Mr. Chave answered it was intended to be broad; elected officials adopt policies, there was a community process to establish them. He preferred the more broad reference to community.

Councilmember Plunkett referred to the proposed change in A.3 on page 3 “The role of commercial and industrial enterprises, the attendant tax base and provision for consumer needs, should be considered as a supporting part of achieving a sustainable community ~~the residential nature of the area~~ rather than as the dominant activity of the community.” He believed that sustainable community meant more multi family density in urban areas. Mr. Chave disagreed with that conclusion. Councilmember Plunkett suggested adding “and the residential nature of the area” after “sustainable community.” Mr. Chave explained he did not think of Edmonds as a residential community; it was a multi-purpose mixed use community. There are a variety of uses including commercial, single family, mixed use, multi family, etc. He did not agree with characterizing a sustainable community as being more multi family. The nature of the community was a decision made as part of land use plans. The key is for the community to be sustainable regardless of how it is configured.

Councilmember Plunkett expressed his belief there was a clear distinction between a sustainable community and eliminating residential area as a preference. Mr. Chave explained the Planning Board recognized that the City includes much more than residential uses and characterizing the entire Edmonds community as residential is not appropriate. Councilmember Plunkett responded the citizens believe Edmonds is a residential community and he did not want that removed from the Comprehensive Plan.

Councilmember Plunkett inquired about the change in A.4.c on page 3 that was revised to read “Public Views ~~views~~, open spaces, shorelines and other natural features” on page 3. Mr. Chave answered that change reflected changes the Council has made in recent years in the development code with regard to unenforceable statement regarding views. The development regulations and City policies support public views but recognize the difficulty identifying/protecting private views. The proposed change is an attempt to reflect that direction.

Councilmember Plunkett referred to A.6, page 4, “Edmonds should cooperate with surrounding communities to ~~ensure that the regional growth policy is consistent with the stated local policy~~ help ensure a coordinated implementation of the regional growth strategy,” suggesting that “and” be added before “to” and leave the language that is proposed to be removed. He commented although others were trying to regionalize things, he wanted to resist it. Mr. Chave responded that decision had been already been made at the PSRC level.

Councilmember Plunkett referred to language on page 4, “Centers will continue to be a focus of development,” inquiring what centers meant. Mr. Chave answered it was any urban center discussed in the regional plan, such as metropolitan centers. Centers are specifically identified in the regional growth strategy; for example Everett is identified as a growth center and Lynnwood has a regional growth center, Edmonds does not. In the classification of cities, Edmonds is defined as a large city but not a growth center.

Councilmember Plunkett inquired about language on page 8 that is proposed to be removed, “Create a regional system of central places framed by open space.” Mr. Chave advised that specific language was contained in Vision 2020. Pages 6 and 7 are the restatement of the new regional plan which actually elevates the importance of open spaces and natural areas. He referred to page 7 that indicates environment is one of the overarching goals in Vision 2040. The regional plan still addresses contiguous open space areas but it is in the detail of the plan.

Councilmember Petso recommended retaining paragraph B on page 1 (To encourage coordinated development and discourage piecemeal, spot or strip zoning and inharmonious subdividing that addresses coordinated development) in the Comprehensive Plan. She commented on the importance of coordinated development in sustainability.

Councilmember Petso asked why sustainable was added to paragraph D on page 1, “To facilitate ~~adequate~~ the provisions for of sustainable public services – such as transportation, police and fire protection, water supply, sewage treatment, and parks – that are consistent with the community’s values and needs. She remarked when she called the fire department, she cared little for what type of fuel they were burning, she just wanted them to arrive. Mr. Chave responded sustainability is much broader than climate change or greenhouse gas reduction, it has to do with overall financing, health of a service, how the service is provided long term, etc. That is what the Sustainability Element is about, climate change is one aspect of sustainability and there is a section regarding climate change in the Sustainability Element. Many governments are discussing what level of service is sustainable long term as budgets decline.

Councilmember Petso referred to the proposal to remove the Hearing Examiner language and a letter from a citizen stating the code requires Hearing Examiner review. Mr. Chave answered an old Comprehensive Plan provision required that review. Councilmember Petso pointed out there was an ECDC citation. Mr. Chave explained the Comprehensive Plan originally was in the ECDC Title 15 and that section no longer exists. The Hearing Examiner is a quasi judicial body, not a legislative advisor. An additional requirement for Hearing Examiner review was contained in the Comprehensive Plan but was superseded by processes the City created over time and contained in specific titles. For example Title 20 contains a specific process for dedications, vacations, etc. The old language also inserted the Hearing Examiner in capital facilities and capital improvement planning which have nothing to do with the quasi judicial or Hearing Examiner process. He summarized in some cases it would have no effect but in other cases it would duplicate the legislative process.

10. EXTENSION OF SUNSET DATE FOR CITIZENS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION.

Councilmember Buckshnis, Council liaison to the Economic Development Commission (EDC), recognized Community Services/Economic Development Director Stephen Clifton, Planning Manager Rob Chave, Cultural Services Manager Frances Chapin and Executive Assistant Cindi Cruz who also assist the EDC. She explained the EDC was originally intended to sunset at the end of 2010. The EDC has great momentum and would like to extend the sunset date an additional year.

City Clerk Sandy Chase advised an ordinance was required to make a change to an ordinance.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT BERNHEIM MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON, TO DIRECT THE CITY ATTORNEY TO PREPARE AN ORDINANCE TO EXTEND THE SUNSET DATE OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION FOR ONE YEAR.

Councilmember Petso commented the EDC was formed before she joined the Council. She has reviewed the seven points of emphasis in the resolution and does not feel the EDC is necessary to accomplish some of the items and she did not support spending money on some of the proposed projects.

With regard to ensuring the Economic Development Director is devoted full-time to economic development, she pointed out if Mr. Clifton is needed for other tasks, the Mayor will assign/ask him to perform other functions/duties. The seven points also include ensuring adequate funding for the proposals which she noted was the Council’s role, not the EDC’s. The seven points include four plans and one vision; she did not support funding plans that were not used. Another of the seven points is to be publically involved in the Harbor Square development. She pointed out the 17 EDC members could do that as individual citizens.

Councilmember Buckshnis urged Councilmember Petso to attend EDC meetings; noting the meetings are very productive. The EDC began with 17 people with very different ideas; they developed seven

initiatives which the Council can enact or act upon. To date the Council has acted on two – the fiber optics and the study by UW students – and work continues on plans for a Strategic Plan. She acknowledged there have been numerous plans in the past that have been shelved but she has been very impressed with the efforts of this group to date. If the members are willing to volunteer their time and spend another year developing more economic development, she was willing to extend the Commission.

Councilmember Plunkett asked whether approving an extension in the EDC's sunset date required the expenditure of any funds. Councilmember Buckshnis responded it did not.

Councilmember Peterson expressed support for the motion. With regard to Councilmember Petso's comment regarding previous studies that were shelved, he pointed out those were conducted by outside consultants with some input from citizens. Because this Commission is citizen-driven, they are unlikely to allow their work to be shelved. The Commission understands the frustration with past studies that have been shelved and that is why they want to extend the sunset date. If the EDC's efforts were stopped at the end of 2010, much of the Commission's hard work would be for nothing. By extending the sunset date, the EDC will keep the Council accountable for the next steps. He found the EDC an incredible group of dedicated, smart, proactive citizens who are asking tough questions of the City, the Council and themselves. He summarized the EDC was one of the most effectively committees the City has formed.

Councilmember Plunkett expressed support extending the sunset date of the EDC clarifying his support in no way should be interpreted as endorsement of their ultimate ideas/plans. For example, the Council passed a resolution expressing support for the EDC working on a strategic plan. Now the EDC's work on a strategic plan has resulted in a potential \$100,000 expenditure. He reserved the right to interpret the resolution in the manner he saw fit.

Councilmember Petso commented the Council's discussion had convinced her, she would support extending the sunset date.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

11. CLIMATE SOLUTIONS NEW ENERGY CITIES.

Councilmember Peterson explained Climate Solutions has asked to contract with the City for Edmonds to become a New Energy City in an effort to transition to a clean, renewable, super-efficient energy system with a comprehensive systems approach that integrates smart power grids, green intelligent buildings, plug-in electrical vehicles and energy storage and renewable power sources such as wind, solar, geothermal and biomass. The Council previously approved the contract with Climate Solutions but that approval was later rescinded due to uncertainty regarding the funding source. In addition, Councilmember Buckshnis, who was not present for the initial vote, had some concerns with community buy-in. He has since received unanimous and enthusiastic support for the program from the Mayor's Climate Protection Committee and from the Economic Development Commission.

Councilmember Peterson requested the Council authorize the Mayor to sign a contract and fund the \$15,000 to partner with Climate Solutions to conduct a citywide workshop to determine a way to achieve the goals mentioned above. Mayor Cooper and staff have identified unused revenues from the Development Services budget to fund the \$15,000 expenditure.

Councilmember Buckshnis reported she met with Mr. Clifton and Mr. Chave as well as Mr. Peterson and Climate Solutions representatives and attended Councilmember Peterson's presentation to the EDC. She was supportive of the contract with Climate Solutions due to the tremendous amount of potential grant funds in the area of energy. Climate Solutions has been a very powerful lobbyist and have now moved to conducting hands-on training. Edmonds has a very environmentally knowledgeable citizenry including

Dr. Rebecca Wolfe and Dr. Rich Senderoff who are working on a Green Business Partners Program. The EDC also discussed how the work related to New Energy Cities could be included in a strategic plan.

COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER BUCKSHNIS, TO AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO SIGN AND TO FULLY FUND THE CONTRACT WITH CLIMATE SOLUTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

12. DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ACTION REGARDING HIRING A CITY COUNCIL BUDGET ANALYST.

Councilmember Wilson explained the draft Request for Qualifications (RFQ) includes many of the changes suggested by staff and the Council. He referred to an explanation in the materials he provided of the problem to be addressed via a City Council Budget Analyst, why hiring an Analyst would be a solution and how the RFQ process differed from hiring an employee. He acknowledged it was an ambitious timeline and suggested the Council approve a work group consisting of Council President Bernheim, Councilmember Plunkett and him to work with staff to publish the RFQ, review applications, and return 3-5 finalists to the Council.

Council President Bernheim expressed his opposition to the proposal to hire a City Council Budget Analyst. He was confident the Mayor could provide the City Council with the necessary information and save the money that would be spent on this consultant.

Councilmember Petso inquired about the funding source and the cost. Councilmember Wilson responded the position would be paid the competitive market rate. He preferred to allow the market to inform the Council of the rate. He suggested the Analyst be funded via the Council Contingency Fund.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked whether the respondents to the RFQ would be provided a scope of work. Councilmember Wilson answered page 2 of the RFQ contained a scope of work. He commented the concept of a Budget Analyst had been suggested by both staff and Mayor as an alternative for Council consideration. He reviewed the RFQ introduction, scope of work, qualifications, information about the City, non-discrimination policy, timeline and process for response. He explained the problem was communication. The intent was not to hire an auditor; the question was not whether the numbers accurately reflect the amount of money in the bank, the problem is there is not enough finance staff to answer all the Council's questions. The Budget Analyst would be an advocate hired by the Council who could meet with Finance Staff and relay information to the Council. He clarified this was not intended as a slight to the Finance Department but a recognition that the finance team used to consist of 7 members and now has only 5.

Councilmember Buckshnis estimated the cost at \$24,000-\$34,000 for two months.

Councilmember Peterson commented he may be one of the few Councilmember who are not as concerned about the communication gap. He agreed the Council did not need to hire an auditor. His primary concerns with hiring a Budget Analyst were funding the consultant although it would be appropriate to fund it from the Council Contingency Fund. He was also wanted to ensure that the Analyst did not become burdensome on staff. He suggested the Council consider reinstating the positions in the Finance Department to avoid this same situation in the future as many of the recent issues could have been addressed if the City had a fully staff Finance Department. If the end result is seven Councilmembers who are comfortable with the budget, it would be a worthwhile expenditure. Councilmember Peterson concluded he would support hiring an Analyst with some reservations. He asked whether the RFQ would go through Human Resources or whether the Council would post the RFQ. Councilmember Wilson responded the Human Resources staff has offered to provide whatever resources the Council needs.

Councilmember Wilson explained his intent was to establish a path for moving forward toward adopting a budget. He was concerned the Council would not be able pass a budget without the assistance of an Analyst. This action is only to post the RFQ; a future action will be required to hire a consultant. He noted this may be a strong enough message to administration about the Council's concerns that things will be different in the future. He did not want to reach the last week of December and have the situation that happened last week or tonight with regard to the budget amendment happen again.

Councilmember Plunkett advised he assisted Councilmember Wilson with the development of the RFQ; the RFQ addresses his concerns. To Councilmember Peterson concerns, he commented it would be a relief to know he was not the seventh person to call or email Mr. Hines and ask him the same question that others have asked.

Councilmember Wilson provided an analogy regarding the City's streets, the capital infrastructure. The City does not fix potholes or maintain the infrastructure adequately and occasionally an emergency allocation is required to repair a problem that arises. Had the City maintained that asset, the problem may not have arisen and the cost of the emergency repair could have been avoided. The same was true for the City's human infrastructure; the City does not have enough staff to provide the services citizens expect. As a result the staff is overworked, their morale suffers, they burn out and they leave. The Council is driving the Finance staff crazy, creating frustration for them as well as the Council. This is the emergency expenditure, \$25,000-\$30,000 for two months. If the City had staff in place, had that investment been made, this action may not be necessary.

COUNCILMEMBER WILSON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER PLUNKETT, THAT THE COUNCIL DIRECT A WORK GROUP LEAD BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT BERNHEIM, COUNCILMEMBER PLUNKETT AND HIMSELF TO IMPLEMENT THE RFQ AND TIMELINE AND BRING BACK A HANDFUL OF QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS TO COUNCIL ACCORDING TO THE TIMELINE.

Councilmember Peterson recommended when the Financial Analyst is hired, the Council make a concerted effort not to email Mr. Hines regarding the budget and utilize the Analyst as a resource. He also urged Councilmembers to support the Analyst and not hire him/her in an effort to "pass the buck."

MOTION CARRIED (5-1), COUNCIL PRESIDENT BERNHEIM VOTING NO.

13. REPORT ON MAYOR'S COMMUNITY SURVEY.

Mayor Cooper explained the City conducted an online survey beginning approximately three weeks ago to measure the community's satisfaction with the work the City is doing and to ask citizens to establish some priorities. He explained 400 people visited the site and 212 completed the survey. This is a non-scientific survey and does not represent any certain cross-section of the community. A link to the survey and details regarding the responses was forwarded to Councilmembers and will be available on the City's website tomorrow. He reviewed the survey questions and responses:

Question	Response								
How do you feel about the overall direction the city is headed? (5 being strongly agree we are headed in the right direction, 1 being we are headed in the wrong direction)	2.917								
In the following areas, please rank your satisfaction with the services the city provides. (5 being very satisfied, 1 being not satisfied)	<table> <tr> <td>Parks Maintenance</td><td>3.91</td></tr> <tr> <td>Recreation Programs</td><td>3.72</td></tr> <tr> <td>Art and Cultural Activities</td><td>3.98</td></tr> <tr> <td>Traffic Enforcement</td><td>3.28</td></tr> </table>	Parks Maintenance	3.91	Recreation Programs	3.72	Art and Cultural Activities	3.98	Traffic Enforcement	3.28
Parks Maintenance	3.91								
Recreation Programs	3.72								
Art and Cultural Activities	3.98								
Traffic Enforcement	3.28								

	Animal Control	3.34
	Parking Enforcement	3.30
	Emergency Police Response	4.06
	Emergency Medical Aid	4.22
	Fire Prevention	3.92
	Emergency Fire Response	4.13
	Street Maintenance	3.01
	Sidewalk Maintenance	2.87
	Flower Program	4.17
	Permitting Process	2.68
	Economic Development	2.55
	Utility Maintenance	3.44
	Customer Service	3.36
	Senior Services	3.38
In the following areas, please rank each area 1 - 5 based on your individual opinion of how the city should be spending your money. (5 being the highest and 1 being the lowest)	Parks Maintenance	3.50
	New Parks	2.21
	Yost Pool	3.12
	Recreation Programs	3.14
	Art and Cultural Activities	3.18
	Street Flower Program	3.04
	Traffic Enforcement	3.21
	Crime Prevention Officer	3.36
	Animal Control	2.86
	Parking Enforcement	2.53
	Emergency Police Response	4.16
	Economic Development	3.89
	Street Maintenance	3.70
	Sidewalk Maintenance	3.51
	New Sidewalks	2.78
	New Bike Lanes	2.48
	Emergency Preparedness	3.49
	Maintenance of City Bldgs	3.30
	Utility Maintenance	3.73
	High School Officer	2.93
	Traffic Congestion Relief	2.73
	Senior Center	3.05
By the end of 2011 the city will need to either make program reductions or have additional revenue to be sustainable into the future. Please rank each item in the following list of solutions based on your individual priorities	New Council approved revenue	2.706
	New voter approved revenue	3.743
	Eliminate programs	2.767
	Across the board reductions	2.795
	A combination of new revenue and reductions	3.575
Below is a list of possible revenue sources. Please rank each area 1 – 5 with 5 meaning you strongly agree and 1 meaning you strongly disagree	Increase property tax	2.75
	Increase sales tax	2.55
	Increase vehicle license fees	2.62
	Charge for parking downtown and in City owned lots	2.57
	Implement a B&O tax	2.38
How often do you visit our city parks?	Daily	12.50%
	Several times per week	28.12%
	Once a week	17.19%
	Monthly	17.19%

	Less than once a month	19.79%
	Not at all	5.21%
Have you ever visited City Hall?	Yes	84.74%
	No	15.26%
Do you follow city council meetings on the city cable TV channel 21/39?	Yes	52.60%
	No	47.40%
Do you find the City cable TV channel a helpful source of information? Please rank 1 -5, with 5 being very helpful and 1 no help at all.	Average score	3.044
What news source do you use to find information about city government? (Select as many as you use)	Beacon	28.60%
	Myedmondsnews.com	13.67%
	Enterprise	22.66%
	Herald	14.93%
	Seattle Times	12.77%
	Edmonds.komonews.com	7.37%
Is the city website a helpful way for you to find information about Edmonds? Please rank 1 - 5, with 5 being very helpful and 1 being not helpful at all?	Average score	3.15

14. **COUNCIL REPORTS ON OUTSIDE COMMITTEE/BOARD MEETINGS.**

Councilmember Peterson reported the Highway 99 Task Force discussed changing the borders of the Medical/Highway 99 Activity Center. The Task Force also discussed establishing a transition zone between Highway 99 and the adjacent residential neighborhoods. Mr. Clifton, Mayor Cooper and Council President Bernheim are encouraging Dick's Drive In to locate in Edmonds.

Councilmember Buckshnis reported Human Resources Director Debi Human provided a report to the Citizen Levy Committee meeting on compensation policies and salary surveys conducted with similar cities as well as surrounding cities. The Economic Development Commission meeting included discussion regard the Strategic Plan and the study of Five Corners and Westgate that will be conducted by UW students, Councilmember Peterson provided a presentation on Climate Solutions, and Rich Senderoff provide a presentation on a Green Business Partners Program.

Councilmember Buckshnis reported the Port Commission meeting included a presentation from Cascade Land Conservancy regarding Complete Streets. The Port also asked about daylighting Willow Creek. She commented on the possibility of funding available from WRIA 8 for daylighting Willow Creek. The Port is working on their budget process and the Harbor Square Master Plan Phase 2 is underway.

Councilmember Buckshnis reported the WRIA 8 meeting that a presentation regarding the Cedar River. The presentation is available on DVD. WRIA 8 is working on legislation to help endangered salmon and to clean up Puget Sound. She also attended the Snohomish County Tomorrow meeting which focused on the continued review of countywide planning policies.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT BERNHEIM MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON, TO EXTEND THE MEETING FOR 15 MINUTES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Councilmember Plunkett reported on the Parking Committee, advising parking permits are at an all time high of 395. He also reported on the Historic Preservation Committee, explaining about five years ago a consultant was hired with the proceeds of a grant to inventory historic structures. As a result of Mr.

Chave's efforts, another grant was secured to expand the survey. He thanked Mr. Chave for his assistance acquiring the grant.

Councilmember Wilson reported of the six entities that formed the Lake Ballinger Forum, only three and possibly four remain. Shoreline and Lynnwood have decided not to participate. Next, he referred to an article in the *Enterprise* regarding SNOCOM and accusation by the union of inappropriate conduct by the Executive Director. He expressed his confidence in SNOCOM's Executive Director Debbie Grady. When the employees expressed their concerns to the SNOCOM Board, the Board hired an outside, independent investigative authority to review the complaints; they were all found to be without merit. SNOCOM is going through a significant cultural change that some people may not like. That cultural change will be a significant benefit to the citizens of Edmonds. During his time on the Board he became aware of several unacceptable things about the operation of SNOCOM; Ms. Grady is attempting to correct them. He was proud to have Ms. Grady working on the Council's and the citizens' behalf.

15. MAYOR'S COMMENTS

Mayor Cooper referred to information about Sound Transit's budget situation and their intent to delay or cancel projects primarily from ST2. It appears Edmonds took a larger than average hit on the project cancellations and delays. Mr. Clifton and he plan to ask the Sound Transit Board and CEO to meet with them which will be followed by a presentation to the City Council. He recommended the Council make its position clear regarding the importance of completing the Sounder station and other Sound Transit improvements in Edmonds as well as ensuring that both written and verbal communication is provided at Sound Transit public hearings.

Mayor Cooper reported AWC has asked him to serve on a Puget Sound Partnership Working Group that will met from now until next summer to discuss oil spills on Puget Sound, a topic he is very interested in. He will serve as one of two city representatives on that group.

Mayor Cooper explained after watching last week's Council meeting, he was compelled to make remarks to the community. First, in the heat of the moment he commented that all four of the Levy Committee members who met with Mr. Hines had emailed him. While all four indicated verbally to Mr. Hines that he was helpful, only two emails were sent and copied to him. One of the emails gave him the impression the person was speaking for all four meeting attendees. If that was not the case, it was a misunderstanding on his part. Second, while he is frustrated with the perceived lack of respect shown by Council toward staff at times, he make a commitment to run Council meetings with a level of decorum and professionalism the community deserves and he did not do that. He felt he had let the community down by letting his Irish temper show through. That was yesterday and this today; his commitment to the community and his challenge to the Council is to look through the windshield and not the rearview mirror and work together in a professional manner treating each other, staff and residents with the highest level of respect and decorum they deserve. He quoted the Chair of the Democratic Caucus in the House of Representatives, the late Representative Bill Grant from Walla Walla who used to say at the conclusion of meetings, "Nuff said."

16. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilmember Petso commented it was discovered tonight that economic development means different things to different people and that sustainability means different things to different people. Over the next few weeks she challenged the Council to reach agreement on those terms before they were adopted into law. For example, she did not read sustainability to mean density. Using her son's soccer schedule as an example, she explained home games for this primarily Edmonds-based team are in Bothell, 11 miles from their home because someone's interpretation of sustainability meant the City did not need to provide fields. A recent away game against a Mountlake Terrace/Brier club was held in Mountlake Terrace, only

5 miles from home. She summarized the system was possibly broken if home games were twice as far away as home games and none of them were in the City where the players live. If the City takes care of its citizens needs, whether by common sense or because it is sustainable, 17 families would not be driving 11 miles to play a game in another city. She assumed the other 50+ Sno-King teams were doing the same thing. If the aspects of sustainability that involve meeting the needs of Edmonds citizens were taken seriously, the result would be something other than density at all costs.

Councilmember Wilson reported his new fence has been installed and he finished his first triathlon last weekend. Next, he referred to Mr. Wambolt's criticism of Councilmembers comments regarding the credibility of the FD1 numbers. He referred to the July 7, 2009 presentation by Fire Chief Tomberg that included numbers and information. The information is not available online. On September 1, 2009, the Council received updated numbers; numbers that he assumed differed from the July 7, 2009 numbers. He reviewed the numbers at that time and raised several questions. The Council then received new updated numbers on September 15, 2009. When the Council reviewed those numbers and numerous questions were raised about the policy implications of the FD1 contract, a new set of numbers were provided on October 20, 2009. By that time he was convinced that it did not matter what questions were raised, he would simply be provided a new set of numbers that would make his questions less of a concern.

Councilmember Wilson explained one of his questions was in regard to the EMS transport fees. As presented to the Council, the transport fees went with the sale of the stations. It was later learned that the transport fees could have been negotiated separate from the sale of the stations. He explained one of the reasons the City did not sell the stations was in addition to the stations, Edmonds was going to give FD1 \$700,000 in EMS transport fees. In that scenario, the City would sell real estate asset as well as the financial asset, the EMS transport fees, for no additional compensation. That cashflow was more valuable than the real estate asset. When the sale of the fire stations and the EMS transport fee was pulled from the contract, Mayor Haakenson said without the stations and the transport fees, the contract was not worthwhile; the reason behind the contract was to sell the assets and use the revenue for operations. Mayor Haakenson later recanted that statement.

Councilmember Wilson expressed concern that these issues continue. For example, the City was trying to determine Fire Department overtime but learned overtime was also included in two other line items. Another discrepancy is the City continues to pay SNOCOM for 911 calls. The PowerPoint presentation repeatedly states one of the savings of the contract with FD1 was SNOCOM fees. He concluded this was relevant because the Council was trying to figure out how to get through a budget when they could not even figure out the story behind the FD1 contract, much less the real numbers. He continued to have doubts regarding the credibility of some of the numbers related to the FD1 contract.

COUNCILMEMBER BUCKSHNIS MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER PETSO, TO EXTEND THE MEETING FOR 10 MINUTES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Councilmember Peterson announced the Chamber Candidates Forum on Monday, October 4 in Council Chambers at 7:00 p.m. The forum will be aired on Channels 21 and 39 throughout the week. He advised another Candidates Forum hosted by D. J. Wilson at Edmonds Community College was available via a link on Myedmondsnews.com.

Councilmember Buckshnis thanked the volunteers who help with the International Coastal Cleanup Day on Saturday, September 25, spearheaded by the Edmonds Backyard Wildlife Habitat group.

Council President Bernheim reported to date the Council budget is under budget; for three-quarters of the year the Council has spent approximately two-thirds of the budgeted amount. He explained it was professional services, primarily legal services that were most in danger of being over budget. He encouraged Councilmembers to hold their demands on legal services to ensure the legal budget was not

exceeded. He reminded the deadline for a February levy was December 22. He thanked Mayor Cooper and the Council for moving through tonight's lengthy agenda. He encouraged Councilmembers to moderate their comments with the goal of ending meetings on time.

17. ADJOURN

With no further business, the Council meeting was adjourned at 10:21 p.m.